

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/726,635	12/04/2003	Masahiro Hasegawa	VX032576	6200		
21369	7590 09/09/2004		EXAMINER			
	L & VARNDELL, PLLC	DANG, HUNG XUAN				
	LUMBUS ST.	ARTIBUT	PAPER NUMBER			
ALEXANDR	IA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2873			
				DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/726,635	HASEGAWA, MASAHIRO				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Hung X Dang	2873				
Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addr	ess -			
A SHC THE M - Extens after S - If the p - If NO p - Failure Any re	PRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' IAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Isions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is increased in the provision of the provisi	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this com D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	munication.			
Status							
1)⊠ [	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Ju	<u>uly 2004</u> .					
2a)⊠ <sup>-</sup>	Γhis action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.					
• —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositio	on of Claims						
5)□ ( 6)⊠ ( 7)⊠ (	Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-9 and 12</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) <u>4, 10 and 11</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Applicatio	on Papers						
9)□ T	he specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)∐ T	0)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct he oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			` '			
Priority ur	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)	cknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority document  Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureause the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National St	age			
Attachment(							
	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) 🔲 Informa	of Dransperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-946) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date			52)			

Application/Control Number: 10/726,635 Page 2

Art Unit: 2873

1. The amendment filed on 7/21/04 has been entered.

### Claims Rejection Under 35 USC - 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-9 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Pavlak** (6,257,719).

Pavlak discloses right and left spectacle lenses (112 r, 112 s), right and left side pieces (116) for holding the right and left spectacle lenses in front of right and left eyes of a user, respectively; and at least one slit provided above the right and left spectacle lenses to extend horizontally over the right and left spectacle lenses wherein the at least one slit (see figure 7, frame 411 has four slits) is arranged relative to the right and left eyes of the user for viewing objects through the at least one slit of the user.

Pavlak does not intend his device to be used for "correcting presbyopia."

However, this feature is an intended use of the Applicant's device and not limiting feature of the claim. The structure of the claim device is the same as that of Pavlak.

Therefore, the claimed invention does not distinguish over the Pavlak device.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 4, 10 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Reasons For Allowance

4. The following is an Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance:

The prior art fails to teach a distance of the slit is adjustable as recited in claim 4.

The prior art fails to teach the elongated beam-like member is to said elongated upper frame beam movably at least in an up and down direction so as to change a distance of the slit as recited in claim 10.

The prior art fails to teach the elongated beam-like member is rotatably secured to said elongated upper frame beam at both ends thereof by means of hinges such that the elongated beam-like member is folded on a front surface of the elongated upper frame beam as recited in claim 11.

## Response To Applicant's argument

5. Applicant's arguments filed 7/21/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argued that the brow bar proposed by Pavlak includes an absorbent insert that makes close contact with the user's face, thus the user cannot observe the object through the slit as that required by present claims 1, 6 and 12.

Application/Control Number: 10/726,635

Art Unit: 2873

This argument is not persuasive because Figure 7 of Pavlak shows that the slits formed on the frame 411 do not contact the user's head. Therefore the user can see the object through the slit. Therefore the claimed invention does not distinguish over the Pavlak reference.

Page 4

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Dang at telephone number (571) 272-2326.

9/04

PRIMARY EXAMINER

TC 2800

HUNG DA**N**G